

REMARKS

This paper is presented in response to the non-final official action mailed September 4, 2008, wherein (a) claims 1-33 were pending, and (b) claims 1-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The official action alleges that “it is unclear how a second mailpiece is sorted using information extracted from a first mailpiece.” See the official action, page 2. However, the applicants respectfully submit that this operation is clearly defined and fully enabled by the instant specification.

The claims recite a method (or device) for sorting mailpieces comprising, in part, obtaining graphic information from a first mailpiece and physically sorting a second mailpiece based on the graphical information of the first mailpiece.

According to the specification, graphical information is obtained from the first mailpiece via known devices such as scanners (see the instant specification at page 12, line 32; and at page 14, line 23), analog/digital reading devices (*id.* at page 13, lines 16-19), code reading units (*id.* at page 13, line 25), video data recording units (*id.* at page 13, line 26), and special reading devices (*id.* at page 14, lines 1-3). The applicants respectfully submit that other devices for acquiring graphical information from a mailpiece are generally known in the art.

Next, the acquired data are sent to a database (*id.* at page 3, lines 19-28; and at page 5, lines 23-29) for storage. A computer (*id.* at page 4, lines 24-26) sorts and analyzes the graphical information from the database to determine whether the graphical information indicates fraud. If the graphical information from the first

mailpiece lacks franking information or has incorrect franking information, the database is checked to determine whether the incorrect or missing franking indicates fraud by comparing the graphical data from the first mailpiece to known fraudulent graphical information in the database. If a match for the graphical information from the first mailpiece is not located in the database, the database is updated with the graphical information from the first mailpiece indicating new fraudulent graphical information. The method or system then assigns a sorting compartment (*id.* at page 7, lines 5-9) to the new fraudulent graphical information.

Subsequent to the first mailpiece, graphical information from a second mailpiece is acquired. If the graphical information from the second mailpiece lacks franking information or has incorrect franking information, the graphical information from the second mailpiece is also transmitted to the database where the computer performs the analysis discussed above with respect to the first mailpiece. Should the graphical information of the second mailpiece match the fraudulent graphical information of the first mailpiece (as updated in the database), the second mailpiece is physically sorted into the sorting bin assigned to the fraudulent graphical information of the first mailpiece. In this manner, the second mailpiece is physically sorted based on the graphical information contained in the first mailpiece (which identified new fraudulent graphical information).

The applicants respectfully submit that determining means of acquiring graphical information, means of analyzing the graphical information, and means of physically sorting the second mailpiece are well within the skill of one of ordinary skill in the art, guided by the disclosure of the application. For example, as disclosed in the instant specification, scanners and/or video equipment may be used to acquire the graphical information. A computer may be used to both store the graphical

information (in a database) and analyze the graphical information. “[S]tandardized computer-aided evaluation methods” may be used. *Id.* at page 4, lines 18-22.

Finally, known physical sorting means may be used, such as computer-controlled gates and storage bins where the gate changes orientation based on a computer input to direct a mailpiece into one or more storage bins.

An advantage to the claimed method (or device) over the prior art is that a new type of fraudulent graphical information may be identified and accounted for and future instances of this new type of fraudulent graphical information may be tracked and analyzed for patterns of use or particular customers or locations may be identified as originating the fraudulent graphical information. Thus, the method and device are highly adaptable to new types of mail fraud. *Id.* at page 6, lines 13-19. This advantage leads to registration and recognition of virtually any kind of fraud pattern, which results in an extremely high physical out-sorting rate. *Id.* at page 7, lines 25-30.


In view of the arguments above, the applicants respectfully submit that the claimed subject matter is disclosed in the specification in a manner that fully enables one of ordinary skill in the art to practice the invention without undue experimentation. As a result, the applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st paragraph, and the applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-33 and allowance of the application.

Should the examiner have any questions, he is urged to contact the undersigned at the phone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

December 1, 2008

By: 
Michael A. Chinlund
Reg. No. 55,064
Agent for Applicants

6300 Sears Tower
233 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357
(312) 474-6300